





*Rationale: The unit has a well-defined conceptual framework and the unit collects multiple types of candidate assessment information. However, there are not clear and consistent measures of the essential elements of the conceptual framework as evidenced in the IR, interviews and exhibits.*

### ACTIONS SINCE VISIT

1. The Unit Assessment Plan has been updated to ensure that there is a strong link between the conceptual framework and the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO). Each of the SLOs is derived directly from the central themes of the conceptual framework. The conceptual framework and the SLOs have been reviewed by faculty during the semi-annual assessment retreat and by community representatives at the February 2011 TEAM LEARN meeting. TEAM LEARN is the College of Education Advisory Board with representatives from key stakeholder groups (e.g., school districts, county offices of education, community representatives, and community colleges). The group meets twice a year.
2. Each program within the college has developed curriculum maps identifying signature assignments that provide direct measures of the SLOs in order to ensure consistent measures of the essential elements of the conceptual framework as defined by the SLOs.
3. All programs summarize progress on the SLOs (as defined in the curriculum maps) each semester. The first of these reports was submitted in fall 2011. These measures are standardized to a four point scale to enable comparisons across programs and to allow for aggregation of measures across the unit.
4. In addition to the direct measures, indirect measures on the SLOs are gathered each semester in the form of responses to the COE student survey. These responses are compared to the direct measures in and thus serve to verify the validity of the direct measures of the SLOs.
5. Progress on direct and indirect SLOs is regularly assessed each semester by individual programs and across programs. The data was analyzed and discussed at the spring 2011 College of Education assessment retreat. Findings indicated that for some SLOs there were a mismatch between the direct and indirect measures and the unit will need to keep an eye on this as we gather additional measures in the future.

## AREA FOR IMPROVEMENT 2.2

**Accreditation Team Finding:**

*The unit's assessment system does not consistently aggregate, summarize, and analyze data at the unit level.*

*Rationale: As evidenced through the IR, interviews, and exhibits, the unit uses data to evaluate and improve programs. However, aggregation and analysis of data was found to be inconsistent across all programs and not yet implemented toward improvement of unit operations.*

### ACTIONS SINCE VISIT

1. In order to facilitate consistent collection and aggregation of data at the unit level, resources have been allocated to fund a Director of Assessment and Evaluation who will report directly to the Dean of the College of Education. Dr. Chris Boosalis has been appointed to serve in this role.
2. The unit collects a wide variety of data across programs in order to improve unit operations. In addition, since program data is on a four-point scale, similar data can be aggregated at the unit level. A COE student survey has been administered every semester since Spring 2009 as a way to get indirect data on unit operations. Faculty are also surveyed annually on items critical to the college. Together with program data, these measures have been discussed on a regular basis at the all faculty assessment and accreditation retreats that are held each semester.
3. Since the site visit, the college has taken steps to ensure that direct measures assessing progress on the conceptual framework derived Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) are collected across programs in a reliable and valid manner. As such, each program has completed curriculum maps that identify signature assignment that measure the various SLOs.
4. Programs report on these measures to the Assessment, Accreditation, and Accountability committee and to the Dean's office each semester. The data that are reported are standardized to a four point scale to allow for comparisons across programs and to perform overall trend analysis.
5. In addition to the direct measures of SLOs, items tied to the SLOs have been added to the student survey. The addition of a second measure enables triangulation and serves as a validity indicator.
6. Findings based on the data are discussed and acted on at program as well as unit levels. A portion of the all faculty assessment retreats that take place each semester is set aside for the analysis of data and possible implications. Some of the findings have led the college to search for ways to improve on issues such as student advising, availability of courses, and student faculty.

## AREA FOR IMPROVEMENT 2.3

Accreditation Team Finding:

*The unit does not disaggregate candidate assessment data when candidates are in alternate route or off-campus programs.*

*Rationale: As evidenced by the IR, interviews, and by the examination of exhibits, the unit has not disaggregated and analyzed data from alternate route candidates or those candidates who are in programs offered at off-campus sites so that such information can be used for program improvements.*

### ACTIONS SINCE VISIT

1. Data collection instruments have been updated to ensure that findings can be disaggregated by program type (alternate or traditional) or off-campus status. Beginning Fall 2011, individual programs as well as the unit disaggregate and analyze data based on alternate route and off-campus status. Currently very few candidates are enrolled in alternate programs (internships) due to the low availability of such positions. Similarly, fewer off campus courses are offered in response to lower enrollments. Still, several sessions are available at the Stockton Center. The only program that can be completed in its entirety off-campus is the Ed.D program. However, the unit requires that separate program and unit measures are collected and reported for candidates taking courses at the Stockton Center.

Data on alternate and off campus programs are regularly analyzed at program and unit levels. For example, responses to the Spring 2010 student survey was discussed at the Fall 2010 COE assessment retreat and although there were few differences based on alternate route or off-campus status, students who frequently attended courses at the Stockton Center indicated a desire for additional offerings at this site. At the Spring 2011 COE assessment retreat, findings on SLO reports were discussed. These measures did not indicate any substantial differences based on alternate route or off-campus status.

## AREA FOR IMPROVEMENT 2.4

Accreditation Team Finding:

*The unit has not involved its professional community in the development of its assessment system.*

*Rationale: The unit has begun implementation of a new unit assessment system. There was insufficient evidence in the IR, interviews, and exhibits of regular involvement of members of the professional community (e.g., school partners external to the unit) in the development of the assessment system*

### ACTIONS SINCE VISIT

The College of Education Advisory Board, TEAM LEARN, meets twice a year to provide feedback on the assessment system and to examine key findings. TEAM LEARN is composed of representatives from school districts, county offices of education, community representatives, and community colleges (See Exhibit X). This group offered feedback on the conceptual framework, Student Learning Outcomes, and the assessment of these at the February 2011 meeting. TEAM LEARN concluded that the conceptual framework and the SLOs in general reflect the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that schools are looking for in new educators. In addition, the group indicated that it might be difficult to measure some of the dispositions defined in the SLOs (See Exhibit II). There are currently several direct and indirect measures included in the unit assessment plan and program assessments targeting candidates' dispositions. All measures, including those measuring dispositions, are evaluated annually for validity and reliability.

## 2011 Team Lead and Staff Finding

After review of the documentation submitted by California State University, Stanislaus staff and the team lead has concluded that the CSU, Stanislaus has addressed NCATE Standard 2 which was not found to be met during the 2009 accreditation site visit and provided evidence that it has responded to the stipulations. Therefore, staff recommends that the COA take action to change the accreditation decision for CSU, Stanislaus from *Accreditation with Stipulations* to *Accreditation*.